

his discovery that the grave belongs to a soldier of the *l(egio) III*, but it is completely uncertain if the inscription belongs to the pre-Actium period (I have seen it and can only confirm an Augustan dating, perhaps from the mid-Augustan period). And even if this soldier should be one of those who were released in the aftermath of Philippi, can this isolated testimony say anything about a real *settlement* at Aquinum? I think on this point (as with some other cases) Keppie has overestimated the probative force of his sources. – The title *Actiacus*, discussed on p. 111, is interesting. However, it cannot be defined as a cognomen; it is a pure title, as can be seen for example from Sylloge 21 and 25 (note the word order). Considering the dating there is no need to search for a real cognomen for the soldiers. In fact, the Greek cognomen *Actiacus* might have had a servile stamp, and indeed it was in use as a slave-name (see my *Namenbuch* 568). – I would have liked (in the fifth chapter, I presume) a discussion on the tribus appartenance of the settled veterans. When were the veterans inscribed in the tribus of their new settlement (as in Sylloge 59), when not (as in Sylloge 1)? Can we know something more about the practices in this respect? The elucidation of this point would be important for example in the study of local population. To the very useful list on p. 133 one could add several items. As to Teanum, I cannot agree with Keppie (p. 139f.). It is completely impossible that CIL X 4796 (4797 makes no mention of IIIIviri) and EE VIII 575 could be from the Late Republic. There was no colony at Teanum at that time, and I agree with Degrassi that there was the foundation of a *colonia Claudia* in A.D. 46. Keppie's veteran C. Cabilenus Gallus is an isolated testimony and cannot show the existence of a colony in the Triumviral age – On p. 209f. Keppie speaks briefly on colonies under the Julio-Claudians, and mentions Velitrae as an uncertain example. But this town certainly did become a colony, probably under Nero, see my remarks in *Suppl. It. 2*, 1983, 18f.

One further consideration. Why has Keppie preferred to transcribe the inscriptions in the useful Sylloge with maiuscles and without solving the abbreviations? To give them as has been done for example by Reis in his *Epigraphischer Anhang* in his study of the *cohortes urbanae*, that is to say in minuscules and integrations, would have greatly helped the consultation.

Some further minor points: p. 15: Turin and Aosta do have Latin names; p. 49, n. 1: there is some confusion in the title of Chocholle's book: p. 50, n. 9 ἑξἑστρατευμένων ; p. 85, n. 148 should read Scarfi; p. 103, n. 15: as to the *Ferentinates novani*, I cannot agree with the explanation given by Keppie, see my remarks *RPAA* 53–54, 1980–1982 (1984) 140–143.

*Heikki Solin*

*Martin Frederiksen: Campania.* Edited by *Nicholas Purcell.* The British School at Rome, London 1984. XVIII, 368 p. V maps, XV pl. £ 17.00.

Campania is a book which was well-known long before it was written. Martin Frederiksen spent much time in Campania studying its geography, topography, and

history and planned to write a book which would "cross traditional chronological barriers and illuminate the patterns of history beyond its chosen geographical confines", as the editor puts it in the Introduction of the book (p. xiii). Unfortunately, he could not complete his work.

Nicholas Purcell has taken on the extremely difficult task of editing the typescript, "that was found in a chaotic state among his papers" (p. xiii). He says that most of it was composed between 1967 and 1974, and that Frederiksen had not worked on the book in the years which immediately preceded his death (1980). N. Purcell has edited the typescript in 11 chapters, and added three extra chapters: 'The Etruscans in Campania', Frederiksen's contribution to 'Italy before the Romans' (ed. Ridgway and Ridgway, 1979), an edited and partly up-dated chapter, 'Economy and Society in Republican Capua' (from Frederiksen, PBSR 27 [1959] 80ff.), and a chapter of his own, 'Puteoli'. The result is a book which contains a vast amount of useful and important information, but at the same time, however, leaves the reader puzzled.

N. Purcell has decided to up-date the bibliography, and to defuse some of the old controversy owing to the shift of emphasis which has occurred after Frederiksen had written the chapters in question. (Especially chapters 3, 8 and 12). He states, that "I have not usually distinguished my additions from the original". This does not seem a good solution. It would have been possible to keep the additions separate, in comments or appendixes, so that the reader could follow the argumentation of Frederiksen which is now sometimes simply cut off. But perhaps this is due to the nature of the typescript. Generally, the literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence is handled with care and brings well attested results. Especially good is Frederiksen's evaluation of the literary tradition of 4th and 3rd century Roman history. He studies the sources of ancient historians, and is able to discard some of the scepticism which has previously prevailed, particularly concerning Livy. In his own article on Puteoli (ch. 14) Purcell is well acquainted with the latest discussion, and the result is good.

Of course in some details of the book there are other opinions, too. We can deal with only some examples. The inscription (no. 19 Frederiksen) in the mosaic floor of the church of Sant'Angelo in Formis at Capua, concerning the *magistri campani* is dated by the editors in 74 BC. However, it is possible to date it in 108 BC, too. Some even think this a more likely supposition (see e.g. Coarelli, in *Les "Bourgeoisies" municipales* [1983] 240). Also, the nature of *magistri Campani* itself is still under discussion. The boundary of *ager Campanus* with Naples is treated on p. 37, ch. 2, 'The Human Geography of Campania'. The town of Agnano evidently belonged to Naples, but the *Decrii* inscription (N.S. [1913] 22–23 = AE 1913,215) from Traianic time is not a proof of that, since the *Decrii* belong to the tribe *Sergia*, and there are no other attested members of that *gens* at Naples, which for her part belonged to the tribe *Maecia*. On the whole, in spite of its fragmentary nature, Campania is an important and useful book.

*Martti Leiwo*